

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSENDER FOR PATENTS PO Box 1430 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.upote.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/646,890	08/25/2003	Satoru Watanabe	1405.1075	1244	
21171 7590 09/02/2009 STAAS & HALSEY LLP			EXAMINER		
SUITE 700			ROBERTSON, DAVID		
1201 NEW YO WASHINGTO	ORK AVENUE, N.W. ON. DC 20005		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
	. ,		2121		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			09/02/2009	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Ī	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
	10/646,890	WATANABE ET AL.					
	Examiner	Art Unit					
	Dave Robertson	2121					

	Dave Robertson	2121						
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the o	orrespondence add	ress					
THE REPLY FILED 11 August 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS A	PPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	ALLOWANCE.						
 X The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of App for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods: 	e reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this plication, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the plication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time							
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A		in the final rejection, which	chever is later. In					
no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	date of the final rejection	n.					
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07 Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date		26(a) and the engrapries	o outonoion foo					
have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b)	tension and the corresponding amount of shortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing date	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as					
NOTICE OF APPEAL 2 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp	liance with 37 CER 41 37 must be t	filed within two months	of the date of					
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(a)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).								
AMENDMENTS								
 ∑ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, I (a) ∑ They raise new issues that would require further cor (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo (c) ∑ They are not deemed to place the application in bet 	nsideration and/or search (see NOTw);	TE below);						
appeal; and/or	ter form for appear by materially rec	lucing or simplifying ti	ie issues ioi					
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a	corresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.						
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.1								
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1:		mpliant Amendment (F	PTOL-324).					
 Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s) 								
Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).		•						
 For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: 		be entered and an ex	xplanation of					
Claim(s) allowed:								
Claim(s) objected to:								
Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:								
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE								
The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).								
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to c showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	vercome all rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fails	s to provide a					
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanatio REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attache	ed.					
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered bu	t does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan-	ce because:					
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s).	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).							
/Albert DeCady/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2121								

Continuation of 3. NOTE: Claim 10 is amended (and new claim 16 added) to recite specific detail in the response to obtaining a "free reply" and accopying an "unquided" reply, the new limitation requiring further search and consideration. As to arguments over 35 U.S.C. 101, methods claims 1-9 recite in the preamble a "server" and in the body, questioning "by a terminar", however, recitation of a "server" in a preemble and insignificant extra-solution activity such as data gathering, data output, storing, transmitting or laple in the preemble does not transform an unpatentable process into a patentable process. As to arguments over 35 U.S.C. 1030, Applicant's amendments and remarks distinguishing the free reply input via a terminal but stored in the processing sever requires further search and consideration.